
SPEECH
OF
HON. WM. LOWNDES YANCEY,
OF ALABAMA,
ON THE
ANNEXATION OF TEXAS TO THE UNITED STATES.

Delivered in the House of Representatives, Jan. 7, 1845.

Printed by HARRIS & HEART, "Constitution" Office.

SPEECH
OF
ON. WM. LOWMYER YANCEY,
OF ALABAMA,
ON THE
EXAMINATION OF TEXAS TO THE UNITED STATES.

Delivered in the House of Representatives Jan. 7, 1845.

Printed by Harris & Harris, "Constitution" Office.

SPEECH.

Mr. YANCKY commenced by expressing a sincere regret, that between the great political parties which had for a half century divided our people, and which must ever exist under a free and popular Government, animosities had been engendered, prejudices had been formed, and acrimonies had been given birth to, which had become so deeply seated in the public mind, that what might otherwise have proven a blessing to our Government, by tending to guard and preserve its purity, had, in fact, become its bane. Instead of estimating measures by their bearing upon the great interests of the country, there were but too many who tested them simply by their contemplated effect *upon party*. That spirit, he lamented to see, had crept into this Hall. Men of eminence and ability had given it countenance; and when, a short time since, he had obtained the floor, in the Committee of the Whole, when the Sub-Treasury bill was under consideration, he had designed (but was prevented by sudden and severe illness) to have expressed his deep and unfeigned regret, that the gentleman from Ohio, (Mr. SCHENCK,) who had preceded him in that debate, distinguished as he was in the possession of a keen and searching intellect, brilliant powers of sarcasm and wit, so rich a diction, and such varied accomplishments, should have lent himself to lower the character of an American Representative, which he appeared so well able to dignify and adorn. The inevitable consequence of the prevalence of such a spirit, to which he had alluded, was that we were fast becoming, if we had not already become, a nation of embittered partisans, instead of enlightened and generous freemen. It is under the influence of convictions like these, (continued Mr. Y.) that I rejoice that a great national question has at length presented itself, which, by its towering greatness, overtops all minor issues—which is so well calculated to purify and elevate the national heart—to call into requisition the nobler qualities of our nature—to create high hopes—to crush beneath its lofty patriotism and undoubted wisdom the contemptible machinations of the mere politician—to rebuke the sordid and groveling propensities of those who know, and feel, and appreciate no impulse but such as draws them irresistibly—

mere bubbles dancing in the wake of party! That question was the proposed annexation of Texas to the Union—a question so purely American, and addressing itself so directly to the honor, and to the great interests of the entire Republic, that it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that all party feuds should be hushed upon its announcement. Every party, and every Administration, for the last twenty years, has so hailed it. Like that mysterious star which of old drew the shepherds' attention from their lowly pursuits to the spot where the Saviour of the World lay bandaged in his swaddling clothes, is this question now culminating over an infant Republic, appealing to us as freemen, and as patriots, to forego our petty wrangling—to arise and accomplish in harmony the great destiny to which our principles have devoted us—the spread of the blessings of civilized freedom.

And this appeal has not been in vain. I thank God that there are still amongst us men whose hearts bounded with renewed vigor at the first flutter of such a banner; and who, like the ancient Jews, when from the great temple the sacred trumpet sounded "TO ARMS!" forgot their intestine broils, and girded themselves for their country and her cause. There are others, sir, who, though still partisans, yet have respected the dignity of the question sufficiently to discuss it in a statesmanlike manner. Not so, however, the Representative from North Carolina, (Mr. CLINGMAN.) With him, the extension of our institutions—the immense effect, for weal or woe, to be produced upon our commercial, manufacturing, agricultural, and planting interests, by this momentous measure—its great bearing upon our military defences—its effect upon the institution of slavery—its consequences upon the fate of the Federal Union, all of which are now engaging the diplomatic abilities, and attracting the anxious attention, of the great and good of two immense continents—have not had sufficient interest or dignity to draw his intellect, or his passions, from an erudite research into the causes why "Capt. Rynders" visited the White House upon a certain day—why that individual dined with another upon another day—why the sailors of the ship "North Carolina" voted in the 7th ward of the city of New York, and not in the city

of Brooklyn!—for such were some of the themes expatiated upon by that Representative in a debate upon a question which was agitating this entire Union, and which, more than any other which had been started amongst us during the past half century, was calculated to arouse the dormant energies of the patriot.

We are in the habit, Mr. Chairman, of forming estimates of persons whom we have never seen, by what we read of their productions, or hear others say of them. I had formed such an estimate of the Representative from North Carolina, and was not, therefore, astonished at this expose of his head and heart. In that portion of the Union I have the honor to represent, that Representative is looked upon, almost without a solitary exception in either party, as a betrayer of the trust which had been reposed in his hands. But I do confess to some astonishment, when I heard even that Representative exulting in his triumph over those brother Representatives from the South, whose most strenuous efforts had not been able to retain the 25th rule, which prohibited the presentation of abolition petitions; and attributing to their silence, on its repeal, motives which every honorable man amongst them spurns with scorn, and which could only have found prompting in the heart of one who had given a stab to the institutions of his own land, and wears the garb of its enemy.

[Mr. CLINGMAN here rose and wished to explain.]

I wish no explanations from the Representative from North Carolina. Explanations elsewhere. Such an exulting cry over our failure to retain this one barrier erected for the preservation of our property and institutions, is an insult to us in our defeat, which merits the scorn and execration of every honest heart in the South.

And even with the estimate of that Representative which I had, sir, I again confess, to some surprise, when I heard him give an account, with much apparent glee, of what he termed the dishonesty of the Senate of North Carolina. Upon the merits of that case, I can pass no verdict. But if it were as represented, would not a truly honorable heart and high-toned intellect have shrunk from an unnecessary exposure of the disgrace of his native State, which he, in part, represented, before the assembled wisdom of the nation? It has been said that the wild deer of the Western prairie will turn and gore a wounded companion to death. But that is the instinct of a brute; for man shrinks from laying bare the failings of his family to the gaze of a censorious world. Such an unwelcome task, if needs be it *must* be performed, should at least be left to other hands. And well might North Carolina, thus wounded by one of her native sons, exclaim, with the falling Cæsar, "*Et tu Brute!*" I shall pass no sentence upon him; I shall not undertake to pronounce what conduct like this deserves; but the Bible (if ever that Representative reads such a book) might teach him the fate of one who forgot what was due to himself and to his

family. Let him turn to that portion which tells us of the patriarch Noah, betrayed in an unguarded hour, by too free an indulgence in the use of wine, and lying exposed in his tent. One of his sons saw his parent's shame, and went forth and ridiculed the spectacle before his brothers. In silence they took a mantle, and, with averted face, approached their prostrate parent and cast it over him—the broad mantle of filial charity—to cover his shame from too prying eyes. The old man at length awoke, and having heard what had passed, gifted with the spirit of prophecy, he arose and pronounced upon him a curse, which has come down upon his posterity to the latest day, that he and his children, and children's children, should be *the servant of servants* throughout all time. And most fearfully has that curse been fulfilled upon the descendants of Ham, who even now dwell in the tents of Japhet and Shem, pitched upon these western shores; proving the stern truths of the Scripture, and offering an awful lesson to him who dares forget his filial duties. How the people of North Carolina will view similar conduct in their Representative, I cannot say; but of this I may feel well assured, had the spirit of that pure and great patriot, Nathaniel Macon, been hovering in these halls, and amidst these stately pillars, and had heard a son of North Carolina utter such language as had fallen from one of her Representatives here, on this occasion, and that spirit could have been susceptible of an earthly feeling, that feeling would have been one of the most unmitigated disgust.

I shall be pardoned, then, by the committee, if, entertaining these views of the character which the Representative from North Carolina has attempted to give to a debate which otherwise had been eminently dignified, and worthy of that Hall and the subject, I do not follow him into the sinks and purlieus of party; and shall therefore at once address myself to the great question before us.

Of the several propositions, which have been committed to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, I am most inclined to vote for that introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky, (Mr. TIEBARTS.) It more fully meets my constitutional view of the subject than any other. It conforms to the very letter, and, what is better, to the very spirit, too, of the Constitution of the United States. It will be remembered that, under the Articles of Confederation, our governmental action was found, and almost universally acknowledged to be, too restricted. The powers conferred were too few—too circumscribed and limited—to give that efficiency, energy and scope, to the action of the General Government, which the interest of so large a Confederacy justly demanded. Gentlemen desirous of ascertaining the true extent of power conferred upon Congress by the Constitution, enabling it to admit "new States," should keep this in view in examining into the history of the article conferring the power. What is its history? Its root and origin

is to be traced to the 11th article of the Articles of Confederation; it reads thus:

"Canada, acceding to this confederation, and joining in the measures of the United States, shall be admitted into, and entitled to the advantages of, this Union; but no other colony shall be admitted into the same, unless such admission be agreed to by nine States."

This article, it will at once be perceived, was specific in its terms, and narrowed down the admission of a State into the Union by the usual legislative action to one solitary State, viz: Canada; yet it had compass enough to allow the confederation to *admit a foreign State by act of Congress*. A convention, however, was called to remedy the defects alluded to, and "to form a more perfect Union." That body framed the Constitution under which we now legislate. Let us note the transformation of the 11th article of the Articles of the Confederacy. By reference to Elliott's Debates, it will be found that Mr. Randolph submitted a series of articles for the consideration of the convention. Amongst them is the following:

"Art. 10. That provision ought to be made for the admission of States lawfully arising within the limits of the United States, whether from a voluntary junction of government and territory or otherwise, with the consent of a number of voices in the National Legislature less than the whole."

It will be seen that this proposition narrowed down, in a still greater degree, the power already possessed by Congress under the Articles of Confederation, and proposed that the new Government should *not have the power to admit into the Union a State arising out of the then limits of the Union*. Gentlemen contend here, on this question, that Congress can only admit new States "lawfully arising within the limits of the United States." Here, then, we find an issue made in the convention on this very point. Mr. Randolph's proposition contravened the spirit of the 11th article already quoted. That allowed the admission of a foreign State; this did not. And, moreover, Mr. Randolph's 10th proposition was opposed to the whole view and purpose of the people in calling the convention and demanding a new constitution, which should augment the powers and enlarge the sphere of action of the Federal Government. What then was the fate of Mr. R.'s proposition? The convention *refused to adopt it*. On the 6th of August, 1787, a committee of five, who had been appointed for that purpose, reported to the convention a draft of a constitution. The 17th article reads thus:

"New States, lawfully constituted or established within the limits of the United States, may be admitted by the Legislature into this Government," &c.

Again, then, we find an attempt made to *limit the power of Congress* in admitting new States. The striking fact stares us in the face that two efforts were made to do this, *and that both failed*. This 17th article was rejected, and, in its stead, breathing the spirit which dictated the call of the

convention, in plain, strong, unrestricted language, was adopted the following article in our Constitution:

Sec. 3, art. 4. New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned, as well as of the Congress."

Who is he—where is he—that can place any limit upon the power conferred by that article, save the good sense of the American people? It is not to be found in the phraseology, for that is in the broadest and most general language. It is not to be found in the history of its adoption, for that tells us that the original, an article in the old Articles, conferred a specific power upon Congress to admit *one foreign State* at least by act; that two propositions to restrict the power were *rejected*, and that finally an article was adopted containing no checks upon the admission of any foreign State!

The proposition, therefore, of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. TIBBATTs) came up to the very spirit and letter of our Constitution, and hence I prefer it. That article which gives us the power, was wisely adopted for the purpose of affording the most unbounded means of providing for the common defence and the general welfare. On the admission of Texas as a State, by these propositions, she is to cede to us her territory, precisely as Virginia and other States had done; and to this no reasonable objection can be urged. I would say, too, to the friends of annexation on this floor, that however great may be individual partialities for some other of the several projects before us, and however well convinced many might be that Congress has the power to receive foreign territory into the Union, (and I entertain no doubt that by a long and subtle train of reasoning it can be logically established,) partialities should yield to that project most likely to secure the great end in view, to wit: annexation. No man can doubt the constitutional power to admit Texas as a "new State." That being so, some such project must be united upon. It effects the great end in a more direct manner, and more in conformity with the very language of the Constitution. The proposition needs a much shorter train of argument to prove it, and nothing but sophistry and fallacy can deny it.

Considering the character for intelligence and enlarged views attributed to the gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. WINTHROP,) I was somewhat surprised when I heard him declare that the Federal Constitution was only designed to operate over the territory held by the people who adopted it. This surely is too limited a view to be taken of that instrument, and of its destined effect upon the world. I think I have already demonstrated that nothing but the *inexpediency* of the admission of a foreign State checks the power of Congress over the subject. If it is not so

where do Louisiana, Arkansas, and Missouri; three of the sovereign States of this Union, now stand? Are they not within the constitutional limits of the Federal Union? And has not the shield of that glorious instrument "ample room and verge enough" to cover those young States? The gentleman from Massachusetts has for years legislated on this floor upon the rights and interests of those States—has collected taxes from their citizens—has assumed and exercised jurisdiction over the vast landed domain within their limits. Whence did he derive the power and the right to do so, if not from this very Constitution, which he says is limited in its action to the boundary of the Republic when it was formed? And yet those States have been erected out of territory which was not within that boundary at the time of its formation. And will he—dare he—aver in his place, that those States are unconstitutional within the limits of the United States? We are told the limits of the Republic were never to be extended! It is a sentiment, sir, as narrow as the limits of the State which appears most to have cherished it. As far as my memory now serves me, whenever the boundary lines of this Republic have been drawn in, and its territory clapt and circumscribed, it has invariably been under the auspices and peculiar direction of Massachusetts statesmen—why was this? Was it that their hearts were so narrow, and views so contracted, that their sympathies could not reach beyond the precise area of territory owned by our fathers at the time they agreed to form and ordain a Constitution, which "should secure the blessings of liberty" to themselves and their "posterity?" Or, rather, does it not arise from that old federal leaven which yet exists in the heart of the Commonwealth—which is ever prone to circumscribe the liberties of mankind—has an aborn proclivity towards the bestowal upon "the favored few" a monopoly of those inestimable blessings which God has given alike to all?

If the constitutional point may be considered settled, that Congress has the unrestricted right to admit "new States" into the Union, then, ranting the expediency in this case, the only question to consider is, will the duties which we owe, in good faith, to others permit the annexation? I respect those who sincerely urge this objection. The honor of a nation is the brightest jewel it possesses. It constitutes the main feature of its character; and should be guarded by its representatives with that sensitive solicitude and watchfulness with which they would shield their own as individuals. Briefly, then, in review of the relations existing, or which have existed, between the two countries.

I will not argue the question of reannexation; nor on that point reasonable doubts might be and are entertained. I speak to the simple proposition of annexing the independent Republic of the United States. If we annex it, and the country ever was ours, reannexation takes place of course: if it never was ours, the

question in this light will be disembarassed of a doubtful issue. Antecedent to the formation of the Mexican Confederacy, but two powers claimed sovereignty over the province of Texas, to wit: Spain and the United States. In 1819, the United States ceded whatever rights and claims it had to Spain. The Government of Spain, however, was prevented from perfecting its title by the protest of Texas, and the consequent revolution. After repeated and ineffectual attempts to subdue that and her other revolted provinces, Spain acknowledged their independence in 1836. These facts clearly dispose of the title of the only two powers claiming allegiance of Texas, prior to the confederacy formed in 1824. In that year the various revolted Spanish provinces in North America joined in framing the confederacy alluded to, under the title of "THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES."

What was the political condition of Texas on entering that confederacy? The United States had quietly thrown up their claims upon her. Spain was endeavoring to make good her own by arms; but, as I have said, afterwards yielded them. Mexico, who claims sovereignty over her, then asserted none—then, in fact, claimed her own freedom at the point of the sword—a gem she was wresting by arms from the crown of Spain. Texas must then be considered as a sovereign in the part she took in joining that confederacy. She entered it an unfettered power. That confederacy, in all its great leading features, was similar to our own. It was composed of sovereign States—giving to the federal head certain powers, and retaining all else. In 1834, that confederacy was violently subverted by a military despotism. The members of the National Congress were driven from their hall by force. The rights of the various States composing it were trampled upon, and a central despotism of the worst character was established upon the ruins of the constitution of 1824. All this was not done, however, without a blow struck in its defence. As soon as the Texans became aware of the ultimate designs of the tyrant despot, they assembled and framed a provisional government—raised the banner of the confederacy of 1824—invited the citizens of the States to rally to its defence. Though the feeblest in mere number of all those States, the gallantry of the Anglo-Saxon shone conspicuous in their conduct. So far from going there under the immigration laws of the confederacy for the purpose, as has been charged, of revolutionizing the country, those brave men were the nucleus around which loyalty and valor were invited to rally in arms for the constitution and against the Mexican tyrant.

Finding the great mass too spiritless to respond to their call, and that the Constitution of 1824 was indeed subverted, the Texans looked to their fatherland for example; they, the descendants of the men of '76, went to the very fountain head of liberty, and there learned the right of every

people to dissolve the bonds of Government, whenever they became subversive of their liberties, and of the purposes for which government was established. They declared, in solemn form, their independence—took position as a free and sovereign State—in fact, were remitted back to that sovereignty which was undoubtedly theirs in 1824, and which no act had since forfeited. Whence, then, arises the claim of Mexico? It is not to be found in the law of nations. She has not even that shadow of a claim which arms can give; never, not for a single moment, has the present central military government of that country exercised, within the limits of Texas, a single legislative act. Not for a moment have its laws been in force there—not for an instant has its authority been recognised there. Not finding authority for her claim, then, either in possession or in the Constitution of 1824, Mexico can find it nowhere, save in her oft-repeated declaration of her determination to conquer Texas. Texas has exhibited then to the whole world, for the past eight years, the spectacle of an independent State—quietly and harmoniously governed by the people—electing her own officers—enacting her own laws—forming treaties with the various powers of the world—as the highest of all acts of acknowledged sovereignty, treating as to boundaries, and recognised by the great nations of the earth as an independent sovereignty. As a sovereign, she has a right to form alliances; and, of course, to ally herself with this Government, unless we are estopped from so doing by a treaty of amity and commerce now existing with Mexico.

Our next inquiry, therefore, should be, whether annexation would be an infringement of that treaty, and would justly interfere with a state of amity between ours and the Mexican Government. I hold that it most clearly would not; and for this reason, that Mexico can urge no title that would be hazarded by the act. And the only contingency under which we would be forbidden to join to our own the destinies of Texas, was the existence of a war, actually in progress between Mexico and Texas. If such a state of things existed, I confess, however unjust and improper might be the design of Mexico, we could not ally ourself with Texas in the way proposed, without making ourselves a party to the war. But is there such a war? Could it be maintained that a war was now, or had been for eight years past, in progress between those two powers? There has been, as all will admit, no military invasion of, or other act of acknowledged national hostility to, Texas, authorized by the Government of Mexico since the memorable battle of San Jacinto. True, there have been some forays—some predatory incursions over the borders, in which women and children were brutally murdered, churches desecrated, and courts of justice broken up and robbed of their records. But gentlemen will not dignify such proceedings as war; they were rather the acts of robber bands, which, under the law of

national comity, would have rightfully subjected the perpetrators, if caught, to the punishment of death. That was not war in which the Mexican partizan had never seen or dared to look upon a Texan banner, or the gleam of a Texan bayonet. And further: Mexico, so far from being in a condition to achieve this much desired conquest, was not able to preserve the tottering fabric of her own Government from domestic violence. To carry on such a war as would be notice to the world to abstain from interference, there must not be a declaration of such intent merely, but an ability to prosecute, and a prosecution of it. But Mexico had neither; she was rent and torn with the most unhappy intestine broils; and this very morning intelligence has reached this city that Santa Anna had been deposed, and a decree of banishment issued against him. Mexico, then, was not only not at war, but had not the ability to carry on a single campaign against her young neighbor. As the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs well said: the best and chiefest sinew of war is money; and this sinew Mexico did not possess. Her treasury robbed and despoiled by her own officers, and her soldiery arrayed against each other in deadly civil strife, she exhibited the spectacle of a revengeful, but dying and impotent, tyrant. A paper war, then, is all that exists to deter us in our movements; and does honor, law, or reason call upon us to pause even in, securing to ourselves a great national good under such circumstances? I contend that they do not make the call. A paper declaration of intent to war was no more to be regarded by the other nations of the world than a paper blockade. It never has been contended that a mere declaration by one power that a certain port of another power should be put under blockade, unsupported by a military or naval force, was of the least binding force upon other nations having friendly relations. The law of nations, (universally admitted to be so,) and the common sense of mankind, requires that the means of enforcing the blockade should be used, or it was a nullity in the eyes of the world. And is there such a difference between the two cases as to require argument to show that the same great principles apply in both? I will not insult the understandings of the gentlemen of the committee by thinking so.

If, then, annexation is not forbidden by the Constitution, nor prohibited by regard for national honor, what should prevent the immediate consummation of so desirable an event? an event which had been steadily pursued as a favorite object of our diplomatic policy for the last twenty years and odd, and through the agency of some of our most distinguished statesmen; and which has ever commanded the public approbation. The venerable gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. ADAMS,) when representing this Union in the Presidential chair, had pursued this cherished policy as vigorously as any. The distinguished head of the present Whig party, Mr.

Clay, then the Secretary of State, had exhibited the most urgent desire for its attainment; and indeed, Mr. Chairman, if there was any one act of the Administration of 1825 and 1827, calculated to relieve it in the least degree from the odium which almost universally rests upon it, on account of its being surreptitiously palmed upon the American people, it was the ardor and the ability displayed by it in its efforts to annex Texas to this Union. Andrew Jackson, too, true to the honor and interests of the country, pushed the matter with vigor, under two successive Secretaries of State. John Tyler, following in the footsteps of his illustrious predecessors, and taking wise advantage of providential circumstances, has again pressed the policy of annexation, never for a moment intermitted; and at once, around, below, (but not above him,) are heard the hounds of party: while, envious of his fortune in being placed in a position more fortunate than his predecessors, to accomplish this great end, its heretofore most energetic and ardent supporters abandon their high ground, to join the smaller curs who bay at him. In this Hall, honorable gentlemen insult the Chief Magistrate as an "accidental President," who "was not the choice of the people," and who had urged this project with impure and "selfish views." Ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. WINTHROP,) who made these remarks, who he voted for in 1840, and he will answer "Harrison and Tyler." And when he gave the vote, did he not know that if it should please Providence to remove Gen. Harrison by death, Mr. Tyler would succeed to the high station by the provisions of the Constitution? It would be great disparagement to that gentleman to doubt it. Was the death of Gen. Harrison an accident? Did the gentleman hold that an event of that magnitude had not passed under the eye of an all-seeing and controlling Omnipotence—an Omnipotence that notes the fall of a sparrow? A Winthrop deny the providence of God! No, sir. He will not, dare not, deny it. Were he to do so, his venerable Puritan ancestry would burst the ceremonies of the tomb, to rise and upbraid their recreant son. The death of General Harrison was no accident. It occurred by the fiat of that Divine Ruler whose ways are not as our ways; and Mr. Tyler succeeded to the Presidency, not an "accidental" but a providential and constitutional President. As to his motives in pursuing a long-pursued policy of the Government, the gentleman from Massachusetts has keener eyes than mine, if he can dive into the secrets of the heart that moved this measure. The act savors well for the good of the country; and I do not envy that gentleman the privilege, assumed to himself, of sitting in judgment upon the motives of another. I have ever been taught the opinion that such a task was unfit for frail man, and that it peculiarly belonged to a higher—a more awful tribunal.

It has been said that in pressing this matter we would take "a snap judgment"—we would

"get the start of the American people." Sir, it is well known to every individual within the sound of my voice, that the American masses have moved upon this question long before it came into this Hall. But it was only when the Senate of the United States most unaccountably, and to the astonishment of the whole world, rejected the treaty, that the people aroused themselves from a confidence and quiet produced by the absolute wisdom and propriety of a measure which they had every reason to believe would command now, as heretofore, an American support, and that they began to move and speak in thunder tones, tones which caused many a heart to quake—whose reverberations shook, from

"Battlement to foundation stone," that immense fabric of power, the Whig party of 1840, and which have not yet died away. This, more than any other agency, produced that revolution in the party tactics—in the party discipline—in the party leaders of the Democracy, which has so astonished and amazed their opponents; and the true wisdom of which, though demonstrated by a magnificent result, their opponents cannot yet understand. This, more than any thing else, it was which gave life, renewed energy and power, to old and stale issues. It was the moving spirit of the day and hour, and it cannot be without power to teach a wise and lasting lesson to an attentive and thinking observer of any party.

The reason for this stirring of the deep fountains of the popular heart are obvious. No great national measure ever presented, in such bold relief, so many and such varied inducements to so many and such varied interests. It is evident that the soil and climate of Texas will give such direction to the industry of its citizens, that the manufacturer, whether of cotton, hemp, wool, iron, leather, or wood, will find there a near and valuable home-market, with a prospective rapidity of increase, which certainly will not fall behind that exhibited within late years by the West and Southwest. The great forest interest will be largely benefited, owing to the known scarcity of timber upon those vast prairies; while the immense and valuable provision and stock-raising interest will feed the millions who will immigrate to those fertile lowlands, and employ their labor in the cultivation of great tropical staples. It will protect, too, the cotton and sugar cultivation from an inimical rivalry, which might, and probably would, be encouraged by our great commercial antagonist.

Such are some of the considerations which address themselves with force to individual interests. There are others, not less powerful in the estimation of a true American heart, of a national character. The annexation of that region will complete what some of the clearest heads in the Union think was originally ours, the magnificent valley of the Mississippi—will give us command of the sources and entire navigation of several of its largest and most valuable streams—will greatly lengthen our share of the gulf coast, and, of

course, increase the number of harbors necessary to the successful prosecution of the vast commerce of our Western regions—will secure to us more natural boundaries, which can be defended with more ease and less expense; and, what must strike a chord of sympathy in every bosom, will extend our noble institutions over a gallant and kindred people, who yearn to resume their place beneath the agis of the American arms.

To motives and considerations such as these, what is opposed by the anti-annexationists? The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. WINTHROP) had disclosed the reason, if it was ever attempted to be disguised before—"it will give a perpetual guaranty to slavery."

Aye, there's the rub! A dread—a fear, disguised under the garb of humanity, that annexation will benefit the Southern section of the Union. I see, in all this, an unmanly shrinking from the responsibilities imposed by the Constitution—a cowardly desire to weaken the slaveholding section by every means which perverted talent can devise—a dastardly envy of a prosperity which still struggles upward in spite of the load which an unconstitutional restrictive legislation has bound upon it.

The enemies of annexation, not only at the North, but a large portion of them at the South, had assailed it upon the ground that it had been placed by the negotiators upon the part of our Government upon the issue of slavery. The Secretary of State, who now fills that Department with such distinguished ability, had been made the mark for many a political shaft because he had the nerve to place the matter, between this Government and England, on its true basis, the transcendent genius to invest it with unanswerable argument, and thus to deserve the thanks of the enlightened and patriotic of the day. That eminent statesman had abundant cause furnished for his course, not only by foreign diplomacy, but by intestine agitators. If the issue is one to be deprecated, it has been made but in defence of a national institution against the attacks of the abolitionists of the North and of the Government of Great Britain. I say the issue has been forced upon the Secretary. In 1838, while a project of annexation was being discussed in Congress, the gentleman over the way, from Massachusetts, (Mr. ADAMS,) made a speech in opposition, running through some three or four days, placing the ground of his objection upon slavery. In the spring of 1843, that same gentleman, with several other members of Congress, issued a circular to the "free States," anticipating an annexation treaty; and urging slavery as an objection to it; and declaring that if Texas should be annexed *the Union ought to be, and should be dissolved!* The piercing eye of fanaticism saw it coming—the keen scent of abolition had snuffed it in the gale—and yet no treaty had been framed—no correspondence existed offering this issue. No. The issue, as far as domestic matters could effect it, was already made by the opponents of annexation, when Mr CAL-

HOUN took the office of Secretary of State. But most of all, this issue was pressed upon our Government by her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. In a despatch made by Mr. Everett to the Secretary of State, under date of "London, Nov. 3, 1843," Mr. Everett says that Lord Aberdeen expressed himself thus: "that it was most true that he was on that, as on all other occasions, desirous to be understood as wishing the abolition of slavery wherever it exists—that this was a sentiment, with reference to which England was of one mind." Upon the 26th February, 1844, Mr. Pakenham, by order of Lord Aberdeen, communicated, officially, to the Secretary of State that, "with regard to the latter point it must be, and is, well known both to the United States and the whole world, *that Great Britain is constantly exerting herself to procure the general abolition of slavery throughout the whole world,*" &c. "With regard to Texas we avow that we wish to see slavery abolished there as elsewhere," &c. These communications were made to Mr. Upshur, the then Secretary of State. An awful calamity removed him in the midst of his usefulness, before he had answered the communication of Lord Aberdeen. Mr. Calhoun, taking the station thus vacated, was called upon to answer that communication. There is not a line in it that does not bear directly upon the question of slavery; and portions speak of us as existing in the slave-holding States of the Union. The Secretary, under date of "April 18, 1844," gave the conclusive reply, which, falling with the crushing force of a thunderbolt upon the cobweb positions of both foreign and native abolitionists, has drawn down upon him the fire, as to the *false* issue made by him! Sir, the *false* issue was made by others—the *true* issue was placed before the country by Mr. Calhoun. The question placed before him was between constitutional slavery and factious abolition—between the Republic of the United States and Great Britain; and he met it as one who knew his duty and dared to do it. Fanaticism, avarice, and commercial ambition had combined against the Constitution, the South, and our national prosperity. The Secretary struck at the keystone of the arch and has most eminently triumphed.

I spoke of the duty of that officer. An institution had been assailed, which the Federal Constitution directly recognises, both in its organization and in the duties it imposes. The second section of the first article of the Constitution bases representative power not only upon the numbers of free persons, but of slaves also; while article 4, section 2, makes it obligatory upon sister States to deliver up a slave if he escape from one to another State. That sacred bond of union does not recognise slavery as a Southern, or as sectional institution, but as a *national one*—it will be confined to no one spot. Its existence was recognised and provided for in Massachusetts as well as in Georgia—the two extremes of the Union. That Constitution would protect Maine at this day in rights based upon slave property

that State chooses to own it—and it throws its shield around Louisiana in the enjoyment of the same rights. And if that species of population in any State should rise in arms, the 4th section of the 4th article secures to it the protection of the armies of the Union. Is not slavery then a national institution? And if so, was it not the duty of the Secretary of State to resist an improper interference, directly or indirectly, by any foreign power? And when he sounded the note of warning, should it not have excited the patriotic ardor of all our citizens, instead of the fierce, bitter, and vulgar denunciations, with which it has been met? Truly did the gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. WINTHROP,) observe, that “some seem disposed to forget the honor, the happiness, and the prosperity of their own country, and to fly off indulging in sympathies for a foreign land;” and it is a remark could never be more appropriately applied than to the distinguished fellow-citizen that gentleman, who, in a recent letter to Miss Carter, said that it remained to be seen whether the august and powerful Government of England would turn aside from her purposes on account of such puny threats as ours! Having thus given expression to my own views upon the point on which the Secretary of State has been assailed, I ask the indulgence of the Committee while I address myself to the reasons why Great Britain is so desirous of affording abolition of our slave property.

The statistical history of the world has demonstrated the immense superiority of a system of associated slave labor over free individual labor in every species of tropical cultivation; while these regions are now, as of old, the great sources of commercial wealth and grandeur to the civilized nations of the temperate zone. To them engaged commercial enterprises are directed, and to the capacity of their inhabitants to concentrate the productions of the older civilized States, the industry must look for its reward. To secure to herself pre-eminence in this vast market, England has been endeavoring to rear up her East India possessions, with a population of nearly millions, as the great competitor of the other nations of the world in the productions of cotton, sugar, and indigo. In a moment of fanaticism, though under protest of her wisest and most sagacious statesman, Lord Wellington, she abolished slavery in her West India islands. The result, so far from answering the anticipations of the friends of the measure, who made it the seducing theory that free labor was cheaper than slave labor, has proved the utter futility and suicidal character of the move. A report of a select committee, to the British Parliament, made July 25, 1842, speaks of the result as having “caused serious, and in some cases ruinous, injury to the proprietors of estates in those colonies,” (West Indies,) “as to have sold many estates, hitherto prosperous and productive, to be cultivated for two or three

years at considerable loss, and others to be abandoned.”

The Assembly of Jamaica, in 1835, speaks, in its address to the Governor, of “seeing large portions of our neglected cane fields being overrun with weeds, and a still larger extent of our pasture lands returning to a state of nature; seeing, in fact, desolation already overspreading the very face of the land, it is impossible for us, without abandoning the evidences of our own senses, to entertain favorable anticipations, or to divest ourselves of the painful convictions that progressive and rapid deterioration of property will continue to keep pace with the system of apprenticeship, and that the termination thereof must complete the ruin of the colony.” The exports of Jamaica, in 1805, two years before the abolition of the slave trade, were over 137,000 hhds. of sugar, and above twenty-four million pounds of coffee. In 1841, after having felt the fair effects of the abolition policy, those exports were reduced to thirty thousand hhds. of sugar, and about eight million pounds of coffee! Trinidad, St. Vincent, and British Guiana, where the same policy has been pursued, all exhibit the same speaking symptoms of commercial ruin.

To the mortification of perceiving her once rich and flourishing colonies prostrated by her own acts, England has to add that of finding her vast East India possessions at a stand still. By a report of a recent date, of a select committee on East India produce, made to the British Parliament, we are informed that “the imports from 1816 to 1825 amounted to nine hundred and sixteen millions rupees; and in the ensuing ten years, to seven hundred and ninety-eight millions, showing a decrease of one hundred and eighteen million rupees for the past ten years; and this during a period of general peace, increasing civilization, and every possible advantage for the development of the trade of the country.” The evidence submitted by that report, shows, too, that “comparing the years 1819 to 1835, with the years 1802 to 1818, there has been a decrease of tonnage of all nations, entering the port of Calcutta, of 192,182 tons.”

The above extracts, which might be multiplied to volumes, but which are sufficient for the purposes of this debate, show, officially, the true condition of England in respect to tropical cultivation. To fathom her designs and views fully, it is necessary to take the same rapid glance at her great antagonist interests—the cultivation of tropical productions by slave labor:

Brazils, from 1805 to 1841, the period in which I have reviewed the statistics of Jamaica, increased her productions from 400,000 cwt. of sugar, and 24,000,000 lbs. of coffee, to 2,400,000 cwt. of sugar, and 135,000,000 lbs. of coffee.

Porto Rico, twenty years since, imported sugar for its own use, but now exports one hundred thousand cwt.

In Cuba, Turnbull, an intelligent English traveller, informs us, “in 1837, the date of the la-

test official returns, the sugar exported amounted to 9,060,053 arrobas of 25 lbs. each: Whereas, in 1829, the earliest period for which I could find a corresponding return, the exports of sugar did not exceed 6,588,428 arrobas. In the same way, the exports of coffee which, in 1837, were 2,133,567 arrobas, in 1829 did not exceed 1,736,257 arrobas; so that the increase of these two principal staples exported in the course of eight years has been nearly 30 per cent." Continues the writer: "Independent of the dry details of statistical tables, the advance of the island towards a high degree of agricultural and commercial prosperity is obvious at a glance."

Now turn your attention to this Union. The following table speaks eloquently of our agricultural and commercial prosperity.

UNITED STATES.

Exports increased from in 1790, -	\$20,205,156
to, in 1838, -	108,486,616
Of this, in 1790, of cotton exported, but	42,285,000
1838, " "	61,556,811
1790, of tobacco " "	4,349,567
1838, " "	7,392,029
1840, " "	9,883,957
1790, of rice " "	1,753,796
1838, " "	1,721,819
Average, however, of rice, of twelve years previous about	2,225,000
Of manufactures exported—	
in 1803, when first reported -	\$1,355,000
1838, " " exported -	8,397,078
1790, of flour " -	4,591,293
1838, " " -	3,603,290
1790, of lumber " -	1,263,534
1838, " " -	3,116,196

It shows, too, the immense disparity of the exports between the North and South; that the South—the slaveholding region—the slave labor of the country, is the mainspring of that almost unparalleled advance in wealth and commercial importance which has distinguished the United States and excited the envy and astonishment of Europe.

Now, I ask a calm and dispassionate review of the picture thus drawn of the situation of the two rival industries of the world—the free and the slave labor. One, though aided by the power, the grandeur, and the known sagacity of one of the greatest powers on earth, is gradually falling behind in the great race of commercial competition. The other, seeming to derive renewed vigor from the decaying fortunes of its rival, is springing forward with an elasticity and speed that will soon defy rivalry. And think you England is blinded to this? And cannot gentlemen see in all this sufficient causes to account for the sternly pursued policy of Great Britain to abolish that slavery "every where," which is snatching from her the trident of the ocean, and dooming her to become a second rate, when she has ever haughtily claimed to be the first power? Or must they, to give a reasonable ground for her course, conjure up the phantom of outraged

humanity, beckoning on that giant nation to redress her long unavenged wrongs! England, the champion of humanity! The first to legalize the slave trade, she clung to it with a tenacity which belied her boasted philanthropy. Her monarchs granted charters to her eminent citizens to monopolize the traffic in human flesh! Her Parliament sustained them by subsidies of money. And the Government of England, in 1713, by treaty of Utrecht, bargained for the exclusive privilege of supplying the Spanish dominions with slaves for thirty years. And in this century's trade in slaves, it is estimated that she has made \$600,000,000!

England govern her policy by dictates of humanity! Where slept her humanity, while the arms of her East India Company swept in desolation and unheard of rapacity over the fertile and populous Ind? Sir, the gorgeous eloquence of one of her own gifted statesmen will preserve, as long as humanity has a votary, those atrocities and crimes, for the indignation of mankind.

To what quarter are the eyes of her philanthropists now turned, that they see not and expose not the present system of slavery, which exists in parts of her dominions, and of tyrannical oppression of the ryotts, which exists all over her vast East India domain?

Or is that what is meant by humanity, which induced her to line the coast of China with her navy—to dismantle her fortresses—to sack her towns—to slaughter her children, in order to force them to buy her poisonous drugs, and thus increase her pecuniary gains?

Look at her parliamentary reports, and tell me if that is her view of the obligations imposed by humanity, in which she desires and contemplates even now to import extensively African laborers? And for what? To force the miserable wretches, victims of her mistaken policy, to longer labor and at cheaper rates.

It is such humanity as keen-sighted interest and vaulting ambition generates, that she may outstrip the world in commercial enterprise. No nation has ever been guided by a more sagacious and effective policy in the main than she; and her designs upon Texas, and through Texas upon the Union, are parts of that grand system for which she is now struggling.

And how are these designs met here? Sir, the champions of her robber policy towards China find no conscientious scruples which forbid their co-operation in a similar system against this nation. The code of morals which furnishes an excuse for the one is sufficiently loose to justify an abjuration of all constitutional obligations to defend the institutions of one's native land. English interests find abettors now, as formerly, on American soil, under cover of reverence for the opinions of our ancestors. The gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. WINTHROP,) who has addressed the House on this subject, tells us grave-

*See note A. in appendix.

ly, "it would be well for us to have some remembrance of what were the opinions of our ancestors on this question of slavery." Aye, sir; I agree it would be well. Our ancestors were as hardy, as clear-headed, and as pure minded a set of men as ever breathed. They had no difficulty in settling the question of slavery upon a permanent footing. And yet some of their descendants are heard, at this day, prating of their consciences and their enlarged views of liberty! And men of to-day, as it were, gravely urge, as an excuse for their traitorous designs, that the Declaration of Independence declared black, as well as white, to be free, and that our ancestors so understood it. Sir, neither our ancestors as a body, nor the ancestors of those who particularly urge this, so understood it; neither did he who urges it so understand it. Many of the signers—it is more than probable the most of them—were slave owners. Slaves were held, in 1776, in every one of the 13 colonies. Aye, sir; and could I now trace back the title to what few I own to him who imported their progenitors from Africa, nine chances out of ten would be that I derive title from some old New England merchant. They were the slave traders of that day; and do you think that those who signed that declaration designed thus to liberate their slave property? No, sir. An industrious friend, fond of research into old and musty volumes, has furnished me with a few facts going to show the view taken of the effect of that declaration, as well as how very glib those grave puritans were in the phraseology which their conscientious descendants can now hardly read in a Southern paper without shuddering at, as evidence of the great moral depravity of the slave breeders!

Constitutional Journal and Weekly Advertiser,

Boston, July 4, 1776.

"A Negro Woman for Sale."

To be sold, a likely young negro woman, that understands house-work, common cooking, &c. has had the small-pox. Enquire of the Printer."

From New England Chronicle, same date and place.

"Ranaway from me, the subscriber, a negro man named Sam, about 5 feet 6 inches high, 30 or 40 years old. Had on when he went off, a light crimsoned colored coat; his upper fore-teeth stick out; speaks good English; has been nineteen years from Africa. Whosoever takes up said negro, and returns him to me, shall have one dollar reward. (Signed.) JOHN HUNTER.

N. B. All masters of vessels are hereby desired not to harbor, conceal, or carry away said negro, so as to avoid the penalty of the law."

From Penn. Journal and Weekly Advertiser,

July 17, 1776.

"To be sold, a large quantity of inch pine boards, that are well seasoned. Likewise, a negro wench. She is disposed of for no fault, but only that she is at present with child. She is about twenty years of age, has had the small-pox and measles, and is fit for town or country business. Enquire of the Printer."

From the Continental Journal and Weekly Adv.

Boston, Oct. 26, 1780.

"To be sold, a likely negro boy, about 13 years old, well calculated to wait on a gentleman.

Enquire of Printer.

Also, to be sold, a likely cow and calf.

Enquire of the Printer."

I trust this remembrance and review of some of the "opinions of our ancestors" will be cherished and reflected upon, and have some effect in restraining the tongue of the puritan of to-day, lest, in slandering the living slaveholder, he traduce the character of the puritan of 1776, from whom we derive title.

I said, too, that the immediate ancestors of some of those who urge as an excuse the Declaration of Independence, did not think that instrument operative upon the servile portion of the community of that day. In proof, I refer to the treaty of peace between the United States and Great Britain, made on the 3d Sept. 1783. The 7th art. stipulates that "his Britannic majesty, shall, with all convenient speed, and without causing any destruction, or carrying away, any negroes or other property of the American inhabitants, withdraw all his armies." &c,

Here is an express acknowledgment of the right to hold negroes in slavery. And who signed it, and thus sanctioned all it contained—in fact who negotiated it? Old John Adams!

And have we any evidence of the opinions of him who has uttered the sentiment I am now combatting? I have a similar proof, to be found in the 1st art. of the Treaty of Ghent, negotiated in part by John Quincy Adams and signed by him. The 10th art. contains this stipulation—"without carrying away any slaves or other property."

Again the laws of Massachusetts of 1776 forbid the intermarriage of black and white persons, and declared any such marriage a nullity. That was one of "the opinions of our ancestors on this question of slavery."

The act of 1843, of a Massachusetts Legislature, repealed this law, and permits the intermarriage of the two races. This is an opinion of the Massachusetts man of to day.

And what has been the result of this repeal? Why, sir, the statistics of the various prisons and alms-houses,† in the free States show that the black son of Africa, with flat nose, thick lips, protruding shin, and skin reddent of rare odors, though free to rise to the high estate of the white man—though the parlors of the proud Puritan are thrown open to him—though free to ally himself with, aye, and even invited to the arms of the fair skinned, cherry lipped, and graceful daughter of that famed race, still retains his nature—rejects with scorn the tendered connection, and prefers to revel in the brothel, until imprisoned in the jail or penitentiary!

And when I hear such boasts of the stern

† See Note B, in Appendix.

morality and love of liberty which is said to be peculiar to the old Bay State, I can but involuntarily reflect upon another one of the striking evidences of the "opinions of our ancestors on this question of slavery." An eloquent and gifted citizen of that old State—a man who does honor to the Union on account of his noble elevation of thought and erudite learning, thus feelingly, and in glowing language, relates the event to which I allude.

"So perished the princes of the Pokanokets. Sad to them had been their acquaintance with civilization. The first ship that came on their coast kidnapped men of their kindred, and now the harmless boy, that had been cherished as an only child, and the future sachem of their tribes, the last of the family of Massasoit, was *old into bondage, to toil as a slave, under the burning suns of Bermuda.*—See Bancroft's History of the United States.

Yes, sir, history tells the tale, that those ancestors, whose opinions the gentleman thinks worthy of "some remembrance," not only sold to the southern planter African slaves, but actually sold for gold the children of that famous Indian warrior who gave full employment to all their valor! Despoiled of their lands, and their children sold into slavery! And "remembrance" of these things invoked here, to give us just ideas of the blessings of liberty!

Let me not be misunderstood, however, as disparaging the just claims of Massachusetts. There has been a time when a noble and enlarged patriotism ruled in her councils, and actuated her statesmen. The days of the Revolution exhibited her in glory, which, though it has not received much addition since, will never fade. An orator has said that she needs no praise—"there she is—look at her. There are Lexington, Bunker Hill, &c." And so they are. 'Sir, I look at her, and find her crowded with villages and an industrious, thriving population: I see immense piles of manufacturing establishments built up out of the bounty extorted from Southern labor. I see Lexington and Bunker Hill too. But the spirit that ennobled those days, and gave undying glory to those fields, sleeps beneath their sod! All that remains of that great race, are their characters. Their descendants have forgotten "their opinions;" and those in whose veins flow the blood of the men who aided in forming this Union, now seek, unconstitutionally, to subvert it, and are content ignominiously to live upon plunder wrung from the sweat of Southern brows!

The consequences of this deep cherished and growing enmity to the institution of slavery, are exhibiting themselves in such a way as should cause good men to pause in their mad career. Not only are the laws of God put at defiance, but the laws of their own country. Societies are formed for the abolition of slavery, which, if the evidences of their own agents are to be believed, connive at and pay for the commission of most ignominious crimes. I speak in this matter a voice of warning to the people of the South. I have now be-

fore me the confession of Charles Brown, who was hung at St. Louis, Missouri, for murder, on the 9th July, 1841, and confesses himself to have been one of the agents of an Abolition Society. He discloses that the Ohio State Anti-Slavery Society is very extensive—say about 18,000 in number, including societies in Indiana and Illinois. Agents are employed by it in nearly all the Southern and Southwestern States—about one hundred and fifty in number. They are supplied with blank certificates of freedom, and are paid from \$20 to \$50 per month, according to their success, or the risk they encounter. It is their duty to persuade slaves to run away, and to give them free papers. They direct them to some officers of an auxiliary society, who take charge of them and secrete or send them to a place of safety.

Recently a Miss Webster has been convicted of the offence of stealing, and running to a free State, slaves. A Reverend [!] Mr. Torrey has likewise been convicted. In the name of humanity and religion these men *steal our property*, induce others to do so, and would aid England in her attempts to abolish the institution altogether, and teach us "slave breeders" lessons of morality! Sir, the great majority of our slaves would blush at such a morality as exhibits such a callous disregard of the rights of another. If these things are to continue—if, as we have been given to understand, the very citadel of the Union is to be made the theatre of exhibitions of hatred towards us as men, and of an eager desire to rob us of our property, as well as of the products of our labor, the denouement cannot be afar off.

And what would success in all these designs bring? Can it be thought of, without an involuntary shudder passing over the frame of every man, who remembers the description of like success elsewhere? Perhaps they were felt by him, who, on a recent memorable occasion, exclaimed with the concentrated energy of vindictive hatred, "let five hundred millions perish, but that the black be freed." Before his vision must have floated the horrors of St. Domingo, where wives were violated upon the bodies of their slaughtered husbands, and the banner of the inhuman fiends was the dead body of an infant, impaled upon a spear, its golden locks dabbled in gore, and its little limbs stiffened by the last agony of suffering nature! But I turn from the picture, sir. Such things will never be on these shores. The gallantry which, in times gone by, defended soil which the patriotism of a portion of New England had not compass enough to include within its vision, is ever ready and sufficient, when the Constitution no longer proves a protection, to protect our institutions and our families. But we trust in Providence never to be driven to so dire a resort. If but a portion of the wisdom and virtue of 1776 and 1787 yet remains to us, the compromises of the Constitution will not only be preserved inviolate, but be protected and perpetuated.

We ask "no preponderance in the Government,"

but we demand safety. So far from the slaveholding region increasing in power proportionately, as some have said, a report of one of your own committees shows unerringly the reverse. By it we learn that instead of retaining our proportionate number of Representatives in Congress, taking as a standard our relative number in 1790, we have lost. In the apportionment of 1810, we fell *six* below what that relative number demanded. In 1820 we fell *seven* below. In 1830 we fell *ten* below; and in 1840 we fell *fourteen* below! Losing relative strength in the representative branch of the Government; having compromised away all possibility of retaining an equality even in the Senate, by the fatal Missouri compromise; with a fearful prospective inequality staring us in the face; attacked day after day, month after month, year after year, by those who are virtually sworn to be our supporters—with the world arrayed against, and its most subtle and efficient nation using every means to subvert, our favorite institution, can we be true to ourselves if we do not demand “the bond”—its fulfilment to the very letter. And if in considering upon this project of annexation, our Great Statesman has felt, and wrote, and acted, for his own land in acting for the Union—if we have ventured to express the reasons we entertain for it, boldly, candidly, and explicitly, as it becomes men at all times to do, nature sanctions, reason approves, the course and the folds of the Constitution should shield him and us from reproach.

The highest considerations of individual, of sectional, and of national interests, urge us then on to annexation, to open wide the door of the Union, to this young member of the family of Republics. Unfeeling hands ejected her in 1819. She has survived the dangers of anarchy and despotism to which that act exposed her. Hers, indeed, is an epitome of our own history. And now, when leaning upon the sword of victory, her garments dripping with the blood of her merciless and tyrannical foe, and in the blue folds of her banner glittering a single star—the “Lost Pleiad” from our own constellation—when Texas, taught at the same fountain, and worshipping at the same altar of freedom as we, having transplanted upon her green prairies our institutions, laws, and religion—demands admission to our confederacy as a co-guardian of the fires lit up in 1776—what American arm can close that door upon her? Those fires were designed sir to spread their genial influence far beyond the narrow confines of the republic as it existed in the days of '76; to blaze higher and higher until they had illuminated every dark corner of the earth where benighted man was bowed down beneath the oppressions of despotic power. Instead of building a Chinese wall around it, sir, let us widen the sphere of its radiance, and add fuel to the flame: “Then let that mighty flame burn on, Through change and change, thro’ good and ill;

Like its own god’s eternal will,
Deep, constant, bright, unquenchable.”

And may the day be not far distant when shall be heard from the borders of the *States of Texas*, the voices of her intelligent and patriotic citizens, mingling with ours in the great drama of SELF-GOVERNMENT.

APPENDIX.

NOTE A.—A select committee on West India colonies, reported to the British Parliament, July 25 1842, a series of resolutions and the testimony taken before them.

In answer to question 24,474, it came out that Sir Charles Metcalfe, former Governor of Jamaica, had “it indispensable for the relief of Jamaica, that immigration from Africa, or some other tropical climate, should take place upon a very extensive scale.”

The 11th of the resolutions reported, is, “That one obvious and most desirable mode of endeavoring to compensate for this diminished supply of labor, is to promote immigration of a fresh laboring population to such an extent as to create competition for employment.”

The 12th resolution recommends “that such immigration should be conducted under the authority, inspection, and control of responsible public officers.”

The Foreign Quarterly Review for October, 1843, also urges immigration direct from Africa!

NOTE B. The relative condition of the blacks in the non-slaveholding and slaveholding States, is exhibited by the following table, made up from official State reports:

The proportion of colored prisoners and paupers to the entire colored population, in

Boston, Chelsea, and Suffolk, is as	1 to 16.17
New York city and co.	1 “ 24.03
Philadelphia city and co.	1 “ 29.03
Richmond city and Henrico co.	1 “ 45.09
City of Charleston District	1 “ 63.48

The above table shows that bond and free negroes stand higher, physically and morally, in the slave, than they do in the free, States.

The report of the Eastern Penitentiary, Pennsylvania, for 1839, says: “The number of re-convictions to this penitentiary, and the continued yearly increase of the colored convicts, are subjects which demand the serious consideration of the Legislature.”

The physician, in his report, says: “The admissions to the prison (for 1839) are, 80 colored and 99 white convicts—which shows an increasing disproportionate number of colored persons, constituting in it a peculiar and important feature; and accounting in a great measure for its sickness, mortality, medical expense, and labor.”

“Deaths have been 11, viz: 2 whites and 9 blacks. The inspectors report, that “the instances of mental disorder the last year, have been about half of those of the previous year; and, as usual, have occurred among the colored prisoners, with few exceptions, and are chargeable to their depraved habits.” “At the close of the last year, there were 161 to 349 colored and 216 white prisoners”—the proportion being 1 to 135. The relative number of black and white in the whole State, by census of 1840, was 1 to 349.